UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,423	01/04/2002	Amnon Ribak	RIBAK2	2434

1444 7590 03/05/2007

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER	
LIN, KELVIN Y	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2142	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/035,423	RIBAK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kelvin Lin	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 November 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-14,16-19,23-28,30-33,35,37-42,44-50,52-55 and 59-70* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *18,19,35,54,55,60,61,65 and 69* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-14,16-17,33,37-42,44-50,52-53,59,62-64,66,68,70* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. This action os responsive to communication: Application, filed on 11/28/06.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 7, 15, 20-22, 29, 34,36, 43, 51 and 56-58 have been cancelled.

3. Claims 18, 19, 35, 54, 55, 60, 61, 65, and 69 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reason for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach and/or suggest " ... wherein displaying comprises displaying the propagation history superimposed as the pathway on the chart showing the hierarchical relationship". As Nakagaki teaches at fig.33 that shows a hierarchy among the users, a hierarchy in their receipt of information, but Nakagaki does not disclose showing the propagation history on a chart showing a report relationship of the users.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 37-42, 44-50, and 59 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakagaki et al., (USPAT No. 5857077).

2. Regarding method claims 1-6, 8-14 have limitations corresponding to apparatus claims 23-28, 30-32. Therefore, claims 1-6, 8-14, are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 23-28, 30-32.

3.

4. Regarding claim 23, Nakagaki teaches apparatus for providing information regarding a piece of electronic mail (e-mail), comprising:

- Processor, configured to process a data set containing transmission data associated with the e-mail so as to determine one or more steps in a propagation history of the e-mail, the transmission data including identifiers of a sender of the e-mail and of one or more recipients of at least a portion of the e-mail (Nakagaki,fig. 1, col.9, l.15-59, the information intervention system processes containing the email server, history collection, and col.10, l.9-16, source/destination user identifier);

- A display, configured to graphically display the propagation history superimposed as a pathway on a chart showing a relationship among at least some of the sender and the one or more recipients wherein the chart includes a plurality of node, each of which nodes represents a single person selected from the group consisting of: the sender and the one or more recipients (Nakagaki, fig. 32-33, col.39, l.51- col.40, l.24, including of user nodes and information regarding user id of sender and recipients, and the chart displays the propagation history path).

5. Regarding claim 24, Nakagaki further discloses apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the processor is configured to analyze transmission information embedded in text of the e-mail (Nakagaki, fig. 8, 9, col.17, l.25-44) .

6. Regarding claim 25, Nakagaki further discloses apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the processor is configured to analyze transmission information not contained in text of the e-mail (Nakagaki, fig. 12, l.12-28).

7. Regarding claim 26, Nakagaki further discloses apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the processor is configured to designate a first visual symbol to represent transmission of the e-mail to a primary recipient, and to designate a second visual symbol different from the first visual symbol to represent transmission of the e-mail to a secondary recipient (Nakagaki, fig. 15).

8. Regarding claim 27, Nakagaki further discloses apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the processor is configured to designate a first visual symbol to

represent the sender, and to designate at least one visual symbol different from the first visual symbol to represent the one or more recipients (Nakagaki, fig.15, the node A with shadow presents different visual symbol from node B).

9. Regarding claim 28, Nakagaki further discloses apparatus according to claim 27, wherein the processor is configured to designate a first color to for the first visual symbol, and to designate a second color, different from the first color, for the at least one visual symbol (Nakagaki, fig. 15, col.22, l.58-64).

10. Regarding claim 30, Nakagaki further discloses apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the processor is configured to drive the display to graphically display the steps in the history in an animation mode (Nakagaki, fig. 15)

11. Regarding claim 31, Nakagaki further discloses apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the processor is configured to drive the display to display a representation of the sender and at least one of the recipients, and to display a graphical representation of movement of the e-mail from the sender to the at least one of the recipient (Nakagaki, fig. 22, and 24).

12. Regarding claim 32, Nakagaki further discloses apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the processor is configured to determine two or more steps in the propagation history of the e-mail (Nakagaki, col.53, l.64 – col.54, l.18), the transmission data including for each step in the propagation history identifiers of a sender and one or more recipients of a respective portion of the piece of e-mail (Nakagaki, col.39, l.57- 67), and wherein the processor is configured to:

receive from a user a designation of an electronic mail correspondent

(Nakagaki, I. col.39, l.57- 67);

find at least one identifier in the transmission data corresponding to the designated correspondent (Nakagaki, col. 39, l.35-45); and

drive the display to display part of the piece of e-mail responsive to finding the at least one identifier (Nakagaki, col.40, l.14-17).

13. Regarding computer program product claims 37-42, 44-50 have limitations corresponding to apparatus claims 23-35. Therefore, claims 37-42, 44-50 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 23-35.

14. Regarding method claims 59, 62 have limitations corresponding to apparatus claims 31-32. Therefore, claims 59, 62 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 31-32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 16-17, 33, 52-53, 62-64, 66-68, 70 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagaki et al., (US Patent No. 5410343) in view of by Moody et al., (USPG Pub No. 20030167310).

Nakagaki does not specifically teach the propagation history superimposed as the pathway on the hierarchy chart.

16. However, Moody teaches the limitations, regarding claim 33, Moody further discloses apparatus according to claim 32,

wherein the chart includes of a hierarchy, wherein the display is configured to display the propagation history superimposed as the pathway on the hierarchy chart (Moody, [0074], [0076], fig. 7), and wherein the processor is configured to:

determine a location of the correspondent in the hierarchy (Moody, fig. 8a); and

drive the display to identify for the user the location of the correspondent in the hierarchy chart (Moody, [0077], incorporated with the milestone on the timeline can be found more easily).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Moody's function of facilitating incoming emails more flexible and rapid viewing with Nakagaki's function of collecting and distributing history information.

The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have collecting and distributing history information in viewing the tracing as per Moody's teaching.

17. Regarding method claims 16-17 have limitations corresponding to apparatus claims 33. Therefore, claims 16-17, are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 33.

18. Regarding method claims 52-53 have limitations corresponding to apparatus claims 33. Therefore, claims 52-53, are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 33.

19. Regarding method claim 62 has limitations corresponding to apparatus claims 33. Therefore, claim 62 , is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 33, and 35.

20. Regarding method claim 66 has limitations corresponding to apparatus claim 33. Therefore, claim 66 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 33.

21. Regarding claim 63, Moody further discloses apparatus according to claim 33, wherein the hierarchy chart includes a tree, and wherein the processor is configured to: determine a location of the correspondent in the tree (Moody, [0063], fig 6c, the mail agent comprises a parser, a document generator, and a thread tree builder, determine the location in the tree); drive the display to display the tree (Moody, fig.8a); and drive the display to identify for the user the location of the correspondent in the tree (Moody, fig.8a).

22. Regarding claim 64, Moody further discloses apparatus according to claim 33, wherein the hierarchy includes a hierarchy of an organization (Moody, [0077], time line corresponding to organization), and wherein the processor is configured

to: determine a location of the correspondent in the hierarchy of the organization (Moody, [0062]), drive the display to display the hierarchy chart of the organization (Moody, fig. 8a); and drive the display to identify for the user the location of the correspondent in the hierarchy chart of the organization (Moody, fig. 8a) .

23. Regarding claim 66, Moody further discloses apparatus according to claim 35, wherein the processor is configure to drive the display to display the hierarchical relationship as a tree, and the propagation history superimposed as the pathway on the tree (Moody, fig. 7, the time line superimposes on the tree and adjusts the time period).

24. Regarding computer program product claims 67-68 have limitations corresponding to apparatus claims 63-64. Therefore, claims 67-68, are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 63-64.

25. Regarding method claim 70 has limitations corresponding to apparatus claims 33. Therefore, claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 33.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-3898. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

2/20/07

KYL

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER